

REVISED STAP SCREENING TEMPLATE, OCTOBER 2022

GEF ID	11416
Project title	Scaling up the Green Legacy Initiative to enhance climate resilience of smallholder farmers in Ethiopia
Date of screen	17 January 2024
STAP Panel Member	Edward Carr
STAP Secretariat	Alessandro Moscuza

1. Summary of STAP's views of the project

STAP welcomes "Scaling up the Green Legacy Initiative to enhance climate resilience of smallholder farmers in Ethiopia." The project has a very clear theory of change that connects climate impacts with other drivers of challenges, clearly identifies interventions aimed at those challenges and the barriers that exist to addressing them, and clearly connects activities to expected outcomes. Aside from some very minor adjustments that could be made in the PPG stage, STAP finds this project compelling.

Note to STAP screeners: a summary of STAP's view of the project (not of the project itself), covering both strengths and weaknesses.

STAP's assessment*

Concur - STAP acknowledges that the concept has scientific and technical merit

Minor - STAP has identified some scientific and technical points to be addressed in project design

Major - STAP has identified significant concerns to be addressed in project design

Please contact the STAP Secretariat if you would like to discuss.

2. Project rationale, and project description – are they sound?

See annex on STAP's screening guidelines.

The project rationale and description are very well-developed. In this regard, STAP appreciated the use of two separate tree diagrams to illustrate the drivers leading to decreasing food security and intensifying multi-dimensional poverty and the interactions between non-climate and climate-related drivers of vulnerability. The climate information provided is extensive, well-articulated and comprehensive, as it covers geophysical, environmental, socio-economic and political factors.

The description of the baseline was very thorough and comprehensive, STAP was particularly impressed by the depth of the analysis and the structure of this section of the proposal, which was subdivided into climate and non-climate drivers of the problem and provided a detailed analysis of an array of a) physical factors such as precipitation and temperature, and b) socio-economic factors such as population pressure and urbanization, multi-dimensional poverty in rural areas, food price inflation and access to basic services.

The proposal also includes a thorough analysis of future climate scenarios and uncertain futures related to climate, environmental, socio-economic and political factors. STAP also appreciates the clear articulation of non-climate drivers of food insecurity, multidimensional poverty, and associated environmental degradation. However, STAP also noticed that, currently, there are multiple climate futures represented in the PIF and to an extent multiple framings of the non-climate drivers, but these are not integrated. Instead, the narratives present futures within different drivers, rather than presenting futures that integrate across the drivers to show how they might interact under different plausible future conditions. Given the depth of information in the PIF, developing these narratives should not be difficult. The project will benefit greatly, as these narratives then capture some of

the potential diversity of future states, and project designers can examine proposed interventions to ensure they are robust across a range of futures and thus able to address uncertainty.

The theory of change was well constructed and built on simple but solid causal pathways that were also very straightforward and easy to follow. The logical reasoning underpinning the ToC was sound, as was the scientific evidence and data upon which this was based.

The innovation aspect of the proposal included one element that STAP assessed to be truly innovative, namely the proposed use of climate change-related data and information to be combined with remote sensing, land degradation and restoration suitability data and the use of digital platforms such as (openforis.org), which uses innovative technology citizen science and community science approaches to collect, manage, analyze and disseminate data. In addition to this, the implementing agency may also want to consider using data and resources from other platforms/initiatives (e.g. [AgMIP](https://www.agmip.org)), which STAP feels would complement well the proposed activities. All of the other interventions and activities proposed were not deemed by STAP as innovative and did not meet basic criteria to be defined as such.

Note: provide a general appraisal, asking whether relevant screening guideline questions have been addressed adequately – not all the questions will be relevant to all proposals; no need to comment on every question, only those needing more attention, noting any done very well, but ensure that all are considered. Comments should be helpful, evaluative, and qualitative, rather than yes/no.

3. Specific points to be addressed, and suggestions

STAP has identified the following recommendations and suggestions, which can be implemented during the PPG stage of project development:

- STAP suggests that, the project build a baseline that integrates climate and non-climate drivers into two or more future narratives that illustrate plausible futures the outcomes of this project will have to address. Further guidance on this topic can be found in the STAP Brief on [Simple Future Narratives](#) and the STAP advisory document on [Exploratory Future Narratives](#).
- For the climate information, STAP recommends updating the future climate projections to the latest versions of the models referenced in the PIF, as recent findings in the sensitivity of the climate system to greenhouse gas emissions suggest that some earlier model outputs have been revised down.
- STAP suggests that stakeholder consultations be expanded to include representatives from the communities facing food insecurity and multidimensional poverty, to ensure that project goals and interventions align with local needs. Given the amount of adaptation work already undertaken under GLI Phase 1, STAP assumes that there already exists a great deal of information about local needs and intervention uptake, and suggests the project build on that foundation.
- STAP also recommends a revision of the innovation section, which should be streamlined and focused on those measures that are truly innovative.

Note: number key points clearly and provide useful information or suggestions, including key literature where relevant. Completed screens should be no more than two or three pages in length.

*categories under review, subject to future revision

ANNEX: STAP'S SCREENING GUIDELINES

1. How well does the proposal explain the problem and issues to be addressed in the context of the **system** within which the problem sits and its drivers (e.g. population growth, economic development, climate change, sociocultural and political factors, and technological changes), including how the various components of the system interact?
2. Does the project indicate how **uncertain futures** could unfold (e.g. using simple **narratives**), based on an understanding of the trends and interactions between the key elements of the system and its drivers?
3. Does the project describe the **baseline** problem and how it may evolve in the future in the absence of the project; and then identify the outcomes that the project seeks to achieve, how these outcomes will change the baseline, and what the key **barriers** and **enablers** are to achieving those outcomes?
4. Are the project's **objectives** well formulated and justified in relation to this system context? Is there a convincing explanation as to **why this particular project** has been selected in preference to other options, in the light of how the future may unfold?
5. How well does the **theory of change** provide an "explicit account of how and why the proposed interventions would achieve their intended outcomes and goal, based on outlining a set of key causal pathways arising from the activities and outputs of the interventions and the assumptions underlying these causal connections".
 - Does the project logic show how the project would ensure that expected outcomes are **enduring** and resilient to possible future changes identified in question 2 above, and to the effects of any conflicting policies (see question 9 below).
 - Is the theory of change grounded on a solid scientific foundation, and is it aligned with current scientific knowledge?
 - Does it explicitly consider how any necessary **institutional and behavioral** changes are to be achieved?
 - Does the theory of change diagram convincingly show the overall project logic, including causal pathways and outcomes?
6. Are the project **components** (interventions and activities) identified in the theory of change each described in sufficient detail to discern the main thrust and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they address the problem, their justification as a robust solution, and the critical assumptions and risks to achieving them?
7. How likely is the project to generate global environmental benefits which would not have accrued without the GEF project (**additionality**)?
8. Does the project convincingly identify the relevant **stakeholders**, and their anticipated roles and responsibilities? is there an adequate explanation of how stakeholders will contribute to the

development and implementation of the project, and how they will benefit from the project to ensure enduring global environmental benefits, e.g. through co-benefits?

9. Does the description adequately explain:

- how the project will build on prior investments and complement current investments, both GEF and non-GEF,
- how the project incorporates **lessons learned** from previous projects in the country and region, and more widely from projects addressing similar issues elsewhere; and
- how country policies that are contradictory to the intended outcomes of the project (identified in section C) will be addressed (**policy coherence**)?

10. How adequate is the project's approach to generating, managing and exchanging **knowledge**, and how will lessons learned be captured for adaptive management and for the benefit of future projects?

11. Innovation and transformation:

- If the project is intended to be **innovative**: to what degree is it innovative, how will this ambition be achieved, how will barriers and enablers be addressed, and how might scaling be achieved?
- If the project is intended to be **transformative**: how well do the project's objectives contribute to transformative change, and are they sufficient to contribute to enduring, transformational change at a sufficient scale to deliver a step improvement in one or more GEBs? Is the proposed logic to achieve the goal credible, addressing necessary changes in institutions, social or cultural norms? Are barriers and enablers to scaling be addressed? And how will enduring scaling be achieved?

12. Have **risks** to the project design and implementation been identified appropriately in the risk table in section B, and have suitable mitigation measures been incorporated? (NB: risks to the durability of project outcomes from future changes in drivers should have been reflected in the theory of change and in project design, not in this table.)